

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the final office action mailed October 11, 2007. In the final office action the Examiner:

- rejected claims 1, 16, 27, 41, 43 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Breese et al. (US 6,006,218) (hereinafter “Breese”);
- rejected claims 2-3, 18, 22, 24, 28-29 and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese;
- rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese in view of Gerace (US 5,848,396) (hereinafter “Gerace”);
- rejected claims 4-7, 9-15, 17, 19-20, 23, 30-33, 35-40, 42, 46-49, 51-56 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese in view of Konig et al. (US 6,981,040) (hereinafter “Konig”);
- rejected claims 8, 34, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese in view of Konig further in view of Gabriel et al. (US 6,584,468) (hereinafter “Gabriel”); and
- rejected claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Breese in view of Konig further in view of Dumais et al. (US 2004/0267700) (hereinafter “Dumais”).

Claim Amendments

In this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 6, 12, 18, 27, 32, 43, 48, 52 and 53 have been amended. Claims 5, 31 and 47 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in previously pending claim 5. After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-4, 6-30, 32-46 and 48-58.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 43, as amended. For instance, as amended, claim 1 recites:

updating the first user profile based on a document
selected by the first user from the set of search result
documents, including
analyzing links within the document and adding
information derived from the analyzed links to the first user
profile....

Breese teaches methods and apparatus for retrieving information and/or processing retrieved information as a function of a user's estimated knowledge. Breese discloses:

After system initialization, operation progresses from step 220 to step 222. In step 222 *input relating to, e.g., the search to be performed, user attributes, user preferences and/or the user's existing knowledge about items included in the information database to be searched, is obtained, e.g., via the user input device 170, or from the Internet browser application 131. For example, the Internet browser application 131 may provide information on which sites a user likes based on a user's frequent access of certain sites and information on a user's actual knowledge by keeping a list of sites previously visited by the user....* In step 224, the user database 104 is accessed to obtain therefrom stored information about the user's attributes, preferences, actual knowledge and/or previous searches. This information is used to supplement the information obtained in step 222. In addition to *obtaining information from the user database 104, the information in the user database is updated* in step 224 to reflect the most recent data obtained in step 222. (Breese, col. 8, lines 15-35); Emphasis Added.

Thus, Breese only discloses updating a user database based on the search to be performed, user attributes, user preferences and/or the user's existing knowledge about items included in an information database to be searched. Breese does not teach or suggest “updating the first user profile based on a *document selected by the first user from the set of search result documents, including analyzing links within the document* and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile,” as claimed.

Konig does not supply the missing limitations. König discloses:

The User Model is a dynamic entity that is refined and updated based on all user actions. (König, col. 21, lines 63-64).

Information about each document that the user views is stored in a recently accessed buffer for subsequent analysis. The recently accessed buffer includes information about the document itself and information about the user's interaction with the document. (König, col. 22, lines 27-31); Emphasis Added.

After a document stored in the recently accessed buffer is parsed, parsed portions are stored in candidate tables. For example, FIGS. 15A and 15B illustrate a user site candidate table and user word candidate table. The user site candidate table holds sites that are candidates to move into the user site distribution of FIG. 4B. The site candidate table stores the site

name, i.e., the URL until the first backslash, except for special cases; the number of site accesses; and the time of last access. (Konig, col. 22, line 64 to col. 23, line 5); *See also Figure 15A; Emphasis Added.*

Thus, Konig discloses storing (in a site candidate table) a URL for a document that is viewed by the user. However, Konig does not teach or suggest analyzing links *within the document* and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile, as claimed.

Further, none of Gerace, Gabriel and Dumais supplies the missing limitations. Gerace discloses a method of profiling a user by obtaining a pattern of the user's viewing actions or viewing habits of agate information. (Gerace, col. 4, lines 12-15). Gabriel discloses identifying links within web pages and evaluating the links to determine the link's relevancy to a given technical field. (Gabriel, col. 3, lines 50-52). Dumais discloses automatically determining whether a user has contemplated a data source selected from two disparate data sources and indexing the data source. (Dumais, col. 9, claim 28). None of Gerace, Gabriel and Dumais teaches or suggests "updating the first user profile based on a *document selected by the first user from the set of search result documents, including analyzing links within the document* and adding information derived from the analyzed links to the first user profile," as claimed.

As none of the cited references teach each and every limitation of claim 1, claim 1 (and associated dependent claims) are patentable over the cited references. Independent claims 18, 27 and 43, as amended, recite similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, claims 18, 27 and 43 and associated dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2007

/ Gary S. Williams /

31,066

Gary S. Williams

(Reg. No.)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 843-4000